

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

2465 E. BAYSHORE ROAD SUITE 406

PALO ALTO, CA 94303

TELEPHONE: (650) 493-4540

FACSIMILE: (650) 493-4549

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 16 2005****FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL**

Date: August 16, 2005

To: Examiner Belix Ortiz

Organization: USPTO

Fax Number: 703-872-9306

From: James R. Riegel

Re: U.S. Application No. 10/010,371
Group Art Unit 2164
Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

This is page 1 of 2 page(s).

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above, and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Application No.: 10/010,371

First Named Applicant: Namik Hrle

Examiner: Belix Ortiz

Art Unit: 2164

Status of Application: pending

Tentative Participants:

1) James Riegel

2) Belix Ortiz

3)

4)

Proposed Date of Interview: 8/17/04

Proposed Time: 3:30 pm

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic(2) ☐ Personal(3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description:

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 16 2005****ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>102(e) rej.</u>	<u>1,4-9,12-17,20-27</u>	<u>Ponnekanti</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

In the office action mailed 5/18/05, the Examiner stated (pages 9-10) that Ponnekanti teaches that a row is skipped if data does not qualify, at col. 3, lines 62-65. However, these lines disclose skipping the row when status bits are "unset" which is not during an update operation being performed, unlike Applicant's claims. Similarly, the Examiner cites col. 4, lines 6-10 and 16-18, but these lines describe a delete operation, not an update as recited by Applicant. The Examiner also cites col. 4, lines 27-30 of Ponnekanti, which describe an update operation, but the described update operation skips a row only when the "lock instant" request can be granted—when a lock is not currently held on the row. Unlike Ponnekanti's update operation, Applicant's update skips a row when a lock is currently held.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by Applicant and submitted to the Examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of Applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, Applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)